

The Quest for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in protesting the administration's Vietnam policy, many of us do not sufficiently stress the wider implications involved in our actions there. Yet we must recognize that the war in Vietnam represents a dangerous overdependence upon military means. Further, it represents an unforgivable disparity between the American dedication to liberty and to the rule of law on the one hand, and on the other, the American disregard of international law and morality.

These two interpretations of the significance of our Vietnam policy are contained in a very thoughtful and penetrating analysis of American problems written by one of my constituents, Mr. Joseph R. Grossman. In his paper, Mr. Grossman convincingly shows us the necessity of proving to the world that our Constitution is a living document which actually guides us when we cope with our internal problems and that we honor our international commitments in the same spirit by a strict observance and even furtherance of international law.

Mr. Grossman comments on the challenges facing America from the vantage point of one who has had personal experience with the forces of aggression. His foresight and sense of values prompted him to leave Czechoslovakia before Hitler invaded. He had to abandon his home and his business, which had belonged to his family for four generations. Later, in 1939, he relinquished a very rewarding position, offered to him by the Government of Northern Ireland, because he felt that the British Government was not adequately preparing for the onslaught of Hitler, which actually came a few weeks after Mr. Grossman's return to the United States.

Mr. Grossman has been a citizen of our country for 20 years, and he is now concerned with the way in which we are meeting the Communist aggression. He believes that superior military might and strategy was the only way to defeat Hitler but that it is exceedingly dangerous to equate that situation with the situation we have today.

We must consider our present military strength—

He writes—

as a preventive, and not as a curative instrument.

I have unanimous consent that Mr. Grossman's analysis be printed in the Record at this point:

MISSING LINKS IN OUR QUEST FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL PEACE

(By Joseph R. Grossman)

No meaningful evaluation of our contemporary scene can lose sight of the following: We live in a world of specialists who are constantly and miraculously advancing our technological progress. In this seemingly unending process, our specialists in the physical sciences have already created the means of mass destructions which, unless wisely and responsibly controlled, could put an end to life on this planet. This realization makes it inevitable that we compare our technological advances with those that can be detected in the fields of psychology, sociology and human advancement per se—and we will arrive at the most threatening and fateful realization that our moral and sociological failings may well bring about the destruction of our civilization through the misuse of our technological advances.

By carrying these logically irrefutable facts and conclusions just one step further, we will recognize that as long as our technological progress is running way in front, we must embark on a supreme and concerted effort to direct the same scientific ingenuity which has shown such phenomenal results in the physical and related sciences, to an ever greater extent toward research in the fields of human conduct and human co-existence and that both in the national and international areas of our contemporary world.

The task to remove the stated disparity and to effectively cope with the bewildering complexity of our internal and external problems requires an effort in depth penetration, which often seems to transcend the present limits of the thinking power of the human mind and of the present stage of our moral enlightenment. It is all the more deplorable that so much that we are now witnessing in official utterances appears to be based on superficiality, on preconceived notions, faulty analogies and emotionalism, rather than on the indispensable interplay between scientific minds of the highest and most diversified order and the field of practical politics. To erect and maintain an artificial barrier between research and political action, can only prove disastrous, since nothing but research, analysis and meaningful anticipation, which must precede our decisions, can adequately guide us, not only as to steps which we must take, but equally importantly as to pitfalls and courses of action which we must avoid, dangers which we must foresee and be prepared for, inequities which we must remove before they get out of hand.

Another prerequisite for the successful management of our international and internal affairs is our detection and understanding of all major historical forces which are at work in our contemporary world. Let us, therefore, make a rationally and morally motivated attempt, to detect and record, to analyze and interpret some of these major historical currents, both internal and external.

The most important area for us to study concerns the formulation, interpretation and implementation of what we hold to be the needs of our national security and survival, which in turn control the major direction and the budgetary support of our total national research effort. The existence of basic flaws in our related concepts manifests itself most forcefully in two dilemmas of profound significance: First, that of our steadily increasing military power and our steadily decreasing national security, and secondly,

in the ever greater disparity between our increasing national prosperity and our decreasing racial and sociological internal peace.

From these premises alone one can logically deduce that our over-emphasis, if not exclusive dependency, on military might as the means of our national survival has no basis in fact and that it would be much more realistic to consider our present military strength as a preventive, and not a curative instrument. In other words, responsible politicians should no longer count on the military as their extended arm; and particularly in our thermo-nuclear age, which is also one of global involvements and interdependence, neither our military nor our political leaders have any right to assume that our most lethal weapons could be used without our country running the risk of its own destruction.

This brings to mind how profoundly and completely basic military as well as general world conditions have changed as of late. When Hitler started his step-by-step military build-up and advances, there actually was no other way to stop him than through superior military might and strategy.

However, it is most regrettable and unfortunate that our leaders seem to equate the situation caused by the Austrian corporal with the totally different military, economic and political global situation which has since evolved and which we will have to examine further. When I previously called attention to superficial thinking and faulty analogies, the equation between Hitler and our present involvement is but one shining example.

Let us never lose sight of the fact that in our day and age "victory" can be achieved only by the avoidance of thermonuclear warfare, and not by its use.

Similarly, in terms of conventional warfare, and particularly on the continent of Asia, any proper evaluation and realization of the actual military factors and risks involved—not to mention the world political implications—would have precluded our involvement there and most certainly in terms of a land war. Instead, rather than extricating ourselves at an early stage from a situation which had been brought about by lack of the needed transmutation of knowledge into wisdom, which is the true test of statesmanship, we kept inventing and promoting false tenets in order not only to justify but even to glorify what we should not have done in the first place. Worst of all, we have neither in terms of strategy nor moral responsibility the right to assume that the People's Republic of China, while well pleased with our involvement in Vietnam and temporarily acting as a military observer, would permit the military scales to be finally tipped in our favor, without coming to the rescue of her ally, as was the case in Korea; nor can we discharge our true responsibility to the American people and to the world at large, by assuming that communistic Russia would refrain from retaliating with atomic warfare,

if such were used against any communistic country. It follows with unequivocal clarity that the only lesson to be learned from the most fundamental facts of our contemporary world as well as from our specific experiences in Vietnam, is that we need to return to the rule of law. This brings us to the major source of our present national and international crisis and calamities: the conflict between the overriding need for world law and world peace and the fact that we responded to what we considered to be unilateral aggression by taking ourselves unilateral military counter measures. Any true belief in